

Docket No.: 237098US2

OBLON
SPIVAK
MCCLELIAND
MAIER

NEUSTADT

P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/696,463

Applicants: Ming-Tien LIN Filing Date: October 30, 2003

For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY

Group Art Unit: 2871

Examiner: George Y. Wang

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Restriction Response

Our credit card payment form in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax)

1:\ATTY\WTB\237098US\PTO CVR LTR 04-08-05.DOC

W. Todd Baker Registration No. 45,265



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

MING-TIEN LIN : EXAMINER: GEORGE Y. WANG

SERIAL NO: 10/696,463

FILED: OCTOBER 30, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2871

FOR: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated March 8, 2005, Applicant provisionally elects Group I, Claims 1-7 without traverse. Applicant submits that the subject matter defined by Claim 1 is generic.

Applicants traverse the outstanding election requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a election is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding election requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.

M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. Application No. 10/696,463 Reply to Office Action of March 8, 2005

The outstanding election requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\WTB\237098US\RESTRICTION 04-08-05.DOC

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

W. Todd Baker Registration No. 45,265